

REMARKS

The Office action of January 30, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully noted.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 23-26 have been added without the addition of new matter.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Correa et al. ("Correa") (U.S. Patent No. 6,241,398). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski, Jr. ("Sikorski") (U.S. Patent No. 6,474,876). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Terada et al. ("Terada") (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114593 A1). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa. Claims 9-10, 12-13, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Correa in view of Sikorski. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, and request allowance thereof in the continuation prosecution application for the following reasons.

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-22 are not anticipated by Correa

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8, 19, and 21-22 stand rejected under § 102(b) in view of Correa.

Initially, it is noted that perhaps a typographical error has occurred in the Action since clearly Correa does not qualify as a § 102(b) reference since Correa was not patented (issued on Jun. 5, 2001) more than one year prior to the effective filing date of the current application (filed on Jan. 26, 2001) in accordance with § 102(b). Therefore, this response will assume that the Action meant to use Correa as a part of a § 102(e)(2) rejection since the current application was filed prior to the issue date of Correa.

Applicants strongly contend that Correa fails to disclose the features recited in these claims such as a faceplate extension projecting from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Correa does not disclose this patentably distinct feature of a faceplate extension projecting from a conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide. In direct contrast to the claimed invention, Correa solely discloses a conductive tubular member 30

extending from an optical fiber 20 that functions as a waveguide when the connector termination 22 of the optical fiber engages the connector 10 of a conductive faceplate 14 of an electronics system (see FIGs. 1-2; Abstract; col. 2, lines 11-19, 43-44, 59-64).

Specifically, Correa states:

...a conductive tubular member surrounding an optical fiber and its connector termination...when the fiber connector termination engages a complementary connector extending through an opening of an electronics system, the tubular member engages the securement nut holding the connector to the faceplate to function as a waveguide which attenuates radiation leaking from non-conductive gaps in the faceplate and connector...to increase the gap length, there is provided a conductive elongated tubular member 30...the tubular member 30 is placed on the fiber 20 prior the fiber 20 being terminated by the connector 22. (see FIGs. 1-2; Abstract; col. 2, lines 43-44, 59-60).

Therefore, Correa directly opposes the claimed invention by actually disclosing an extension from the connecting optical fiber to function as a waveguide rather than the recited feature of an extension from the faceplate around the periphery of the faceplate opening to form a waveguide. Applicants strongly contend that Correa's disclosure of extending from the connecting optical fiber to function as a waveguide is significantly different than extending from the faceplate opening around the periphery to form a waveguide as recited in the claims.

Also, it is noted that the Action contends that the conductive nut 24 disclosed by Correa is a faceplate extension forming a waveguide. However, as disclosed throughout Correa, conductive nut

24 simply functions to secure the connector 10 (which engages the optical fiber connector termination 22) to the faceplate 14. Specifically, Correa states that "...the securement nut holding the connector to the faceplate...a conductive nut 24 is provided to secure the connector 10 to the faceplate 14...the nut 24 is used to secure the connector 10 to the faceplate 14..." (see FIGs. 1-2; Abstract; col. 2, lines 31-39). Therefore, clearly, conductive nut 24 solely functions to secure the connector 10 (which engages the optical fiber connector termination 22) to the faceplate 14 and does not function as a faceplate extension to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited. In accordance with the Correa disclosure, only the tubular member 30, extending from and surrounding the optical fiber 20, functions as an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide which strongly contrasts with the recited feature of a faceplate extension forming an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide.

Therefore, it is clear that Correa does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 3 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 3 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features

recited in this claim such as a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide rather than a faceplate extension forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, both Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the

recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited references.

Claim 6 is not made obvious by Correa and Terada

Claim 6 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Terada. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide rather than a faceplate extension forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited.

Similarly, Terada does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Terada solely discloses a laser diode module including a laser diode, lens, and optical fiber (see FIG. 1; paragraph 10). Clearly, there is a significant difference between Terada's laser diode module and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from

around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the laser diode module does not function as a faceplate extension to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited. Therefore, both Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 7 is not made obvious by Correa

Claim 7 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa. Applicants strongly contend that Correa fails to disclose the features recited in these claims such as a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide rather than a faceplate extension forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited.

Therefore, Correa does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 16-18, and 20 are not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claims 9-10, 12-13, 16-18, and 20 stand rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from around the periphery

of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 11 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 11 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 14 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 14 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Again, it is noted that perhaps a typographical error has occurred in the Action since Terada was cited before in the Action to allegedly disclose the use of an aluminum alloy for the faceplate and faceplate extension as recited in claim 6. It is assumed that Terada was meant to be cited as well for claim 14 to allegedly disclose this feature.

Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one

of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide.

Similarly, Terada does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Terada solely discloses a laser diode module including a laser diode, lens, and optical fiber (see FIG. 1; paragraph 10). Clearly, there is a significant difference between Terada's laser diode module and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the laser diode module does not function as a faceplate extension to form an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide as recited. Therefore, both Correa and Terada, either alone or in combination, do not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Claim 15 is not made obvious by Correa and Sikorski

Claim 15 stands rejected under § 103(a) in view of Correa and Sikorski. Applicants strongly contend that Correa and Sikorski, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in this claim such as each faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of a corresponding one of the plurality of faceplate openings, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

As contended above, Correa does not disclose this feature as Correa solely discloses a directly contrasting feature of providing an extension from the connecting optical fiber (connecting with the faceplate connector) to function as a waveguide.

Similarly, Sikorski does not disclose the recited feature of a faceplate extension projecting from said conductive faceplate, around the periphery of the faceplate opening, and forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide.

Sikorski solely discloses an optical fiber adaptor, mountable within a faceplate, for receiving an optical fiber termination connector (see FIGs. 1-2; col. 2, lines 34-47). Clearly, there is a significant difference between an optical fiber adaptor and the recited feature of a faceplate extension, from around the periphery of the faceplate opening, forming an electrostatic or electromagnetic waveguide since the adaptor solely functions to receive an optical fiber termination and does not form an electromagnetic or electrostatic waveguide. Therefore, Sikorski

does not disclose the recited feature making the claimed invention patentably distinct and non-obvious from the cited reference.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the remaining claims are allowable and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH, & BIRCH, LLP

C.D.
by 
Michael R. Cammarata, Reg. #39,491

MRC/CAG:tm
1163-0266P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
Phone: (703) 205-8000